## State of Arizona COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

Disposition	n of Complaint 08-254	
Complainant:	No.	1332510553A
Judge:	No.	1332510553B

### ORDER

The commission reviewed the complaint filed in this matter and found no ethical misconduct on the part of the judge. The judge followed established case law in his decision not to change the child's name and issued a thoughtful minute entry regarding the decision. There is no evidence of religious or ethnic bias. Whether or not the judge made the correct decision is a legal question and the more appropriate remedy would have been to appeal the judge's decision to a court with proper jurisdiction.

The commission is not a court and cannot change a judge's decisions; therefore, the complaint is dismissed pursuant to Rules 16(a) and 23.

Dated: November 4, 2008.

FOR THE COMMISSION

\s\ Keith Stott Executive Director

Copies of this order were mailed to the complainant and the judge on November 4, 2008.

This order may not be used as a basis for disqualification of a judge.

## CJC - 08 - 254 OCT 14 2008

#### TO : COMMISSION ON JUDICIAL CONDUCT

#### DISCRIMINTION ISSUED

I am the Petitioner , in this Case, I asking this office to open an instigation this case, because this Judge make very Much fraud and discrimination against me because am a Muslim man, as following :

1- This Case Never seen the Justice From the dated This judge start working in this Case , However he always Was against Me , in this Case [ because am a Muslim , second 1 was not have an attorney ]. And he think THAT any one he not have Attorney will Loss his Case .

2- The Judge Enter Minute Entry, about the Baby Name, and PUT the baby Under the Mom Name, 100 %, HOWEVER, the [ court adviser report , was very Clear in this Issued, THAT baby name has to be change complete Name ].

3- In the Trial hearing at The Judge say he don't Care about the Court adviser Never, And he keep the Baby Name Same thing Under the Mom name 100 %, with Out any change, .

4- The Judge do that Only Because he don't Like Muslim people, and he don't want the baby take his father Muslim name.

5- Petitioner File [ notice for New hearing ] Pursuant To A F R, But this Judge denying the Notice, Because he Say has to be Motion for new trail Not Notice, HOWEVER this Judge know Very good the Petitioner Not attorney and Don't speak good English, AND that Why this Judge keep asking for translation for the Petitioner All The Case times, .

6- This Judge denying Petitioner Notice NOT because the world [Notice OR Motion], BUT because he don't want the baby Under the Muslim name, HOWEVER this Judge denying the Petitioner Notice Pursuant To Rule 83.

7- Petitioner asking to denying the Judge Minute Entry at Pursuant to

# CJC-08-254

Same Rule That this judge Use wrong world To, when he Use Motion, Not Notice, and say [IT IS ORDERED DENYING Petitioner Motion for New trail] see attachment.

FORTHER any one review This Case understand this is [ discrimination Issued ] NOT [ Legal Issued ], That why am asking for investigation This Case.

NOTICE the Petitioner did file other [Notice to change temporary Custody at and FOR SURE this Judge will denying this Notice For any Reason.

•